

REMARKS

1. Claim Objections – 37 CFR 1.75(a)

Claims 13 – 18 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a) for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention.

5 **Response**

Claim 13

 Claim 13 has been amended to clearly state that the shift distance is a distance between the pick-up head and the object lens. This is fully supported by specification paragraph [29]. Claim 13 has also been amended to state that the control module
10 determines the predetermined shift range and the shift distance. As the control module controls operations of the stepping motor, the pick-up head, and the object lens it is clear that the control module can thereby determine distances between said elements. Furthermore, this limitation is fully supported by specification paragraph [23]. Therefore, the applicant believes that currently amended Claim 13 overcomes the 37 CFR 1.75(a)
15 objections.

Claims 14 – 16

 Claims 14 – 16 are dependent on Claim 13 and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 13 overcomes the objections.

Claim 17

20 Claim 17 has been amended in the same way as Claim 13. As both claims are system claims and objections to both claims were the same, the applicant believes that currently amended Claim 17 overcomes the 37 CFR 1.75(a) objections.

Claim 18

Claim 18 has been amended to include a step of comparing the shift distance with a predetermined shift range. The shift distance is also defined as the distance between the object lens and the pick-up head. The applicant therefore believes that currently amended
5 Claim 18 overcomes the 37 CFR 1.75(a) objections.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 13 – 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lim.

Response

Claim 13

10 Claim 13 contains the limitation that the stepping motor will stop the sled from moving when a shift distance corresponding to a distance between the pick-up head and the object lens is **lower** than a predetermined range. Lim claims a stepping motor for driving a sled that operates when a **deviation exceeds a threshold range**. Lim does not teach **stopping** the sled when the deviation is **less than** this threshold range. Furthermore,
15 the Examiner himself states that “inherently the sled and the pickup head (*of Lim*) is not moved when the deviation remains within the threshold range”. As Claim 13 teaches moving the sled while the shift distance remains within the predetermined range, and as Lim does not teach controlling the stepping motor to stop the sled when the deviation (shift distance) is below the threshold range (predetermined range), the applicant asserts
20 that Claim 13 should be found allowable over the prior art.

Additionally, Lim teaches maintaining the center of the object lens around the optical axis within a prescribed range and further discloses checking whether the deviation remains within a threshold range shown in Fig. 6 [col. 2, lines 9 – 12; col. 3, lines 51 – 52]. As clearly shown in Lim Fig. 6, the deviation is defined as a DC

component of a **tracking error** signal. In col. 1, lines 45 – 47, Lim also states that the tracking error signal is used to make the laser beam spot follow a **target track**. As knowing the deviation between the objective lens and the optical pick-up head has nothing to do with making the laser beam spot follow the target track, the applicant
5 respectfully points out that the deviation taught by Lim is indicative of a distance between the center of the object lens and the target track in a radial direction of an optical disc, rather than the claimed shift distance between **the pick-up head and the object lens** movably placed on the pick-up head.

In light of the above reasons, the applicant believes that the rejections under 35
10 U.S.C. 102(e) have been overcome.

Claims 14 – 16

Claims 14 – 16 are dependent on Claim 13. As the applicant believes that Claim 13 has been placed in a position for allowance, claims 14 – 16 should also be found
15 allowable.

3. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 – 12 were deemed allowable by the Examiner.

Response

The applicant is grateful to the Examiner for the allowance.

20 Claims 17 – 18 would be found allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the 37 CFR 1.75(a) objection.

Response

Appl. No. 10/711,507
Amdt. dated August 13, 2007
Reply to Office action of June 04, 2007

Claims 17 – 18 have been amended to overcome the objection under 37 CFR 1.75(a) as detailed in the section “Claim Objections”.

Conclusion:

Thus, all pending claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance with respect to
5 the cited art for at least the reasons presented above. The Examiner is encouraged to
telephone the undersigned if there are informalities that can be resolved in a phone
conversation, or if the Examiner has any ideas or suggestions for further advancing the
prosecution of this case.

10 Sincerely yours,



Date: 08.13.2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

15 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.
20 is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)